

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 27-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Core Wed3D” (“*Core*”) in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0010571 to Daniels et al. (“*Daniels*”). Claims 27-42 remain pending.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 27-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Core* in view of *Daniels*.

Independent claims 27 recites “[a] content providing method” including “forming multimedia content by collecting scenes, each scene containing a component group formed by customizing and arbitrarily combining a plurality of components operating on a browser, the scene also containing a script for operating each component.” On page 3 of the Office Action the Examiner appears to allege that *Core* discloses the claimed “scene.” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Core discloses that “[w]ork-builder tools are 3D authoring programs that you can use to create entire VRML scenes from scratch. You can use world builders to assemble preexisting VRML objects into scenes.” (*Core*, p. 1, § World Builders, ¶ 1). Furthermore, “[w]orld builders typically come with libraries of premade objects [to] . . . use as the basis for your own objects.” (*Id.* at ¶ 2). The Examiner appears to allege that *Core*’s VRML scenes, own objects, and premade objects constitute the claimed “scenes,” “component group,” and “plurality of components,” respectively. However, this is incorrect, because *Core*’s own objects are not “formed by customizing . . . a plurality of components operating on a browser,” as recited by claim 27 (emphasis added). Instead, the alleged “plurality components” are premade objects and are not “customiz[ed]” as claimed.

Core does not disclose the claimed "scene" because Core does not disclose "the scene containing a script for operating each component," as recited by claim 27. Core discloses "[p]rototypes are often used to construct reusable geometric shapes and modes, interface elements, . . . animated objects, mathematical functions, custom appearances, and special effects." (Core, p. 16, § Prototypes, ¶ 2). Furthermore, "prototypes can be created using . . . Script nodes that contain programs written in languages such as Java and JavaScript." (Id.) On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner appears to allege that Core's Script nodes constitute the claimed "script," and that Core's prototypes constitute the claimed "component." Even if, *arguendo*, Core's prototypes constitute the claimed "component," (which Applicant does not concede) Core's Script nodes are not "for operating each component," as recited in claim 27. Instead, "prototypes can be created using any number of VRML's built in nodes." (Core, p. 16, § Prototypes, ¶ 2, emphasis added). Finally, Core does not discuss Script nodes with respect to VMRL scenes, and therefore does not disclose "the scene containing a script," as recited by claim 27 (emphasis added). Accordingly, Core fails to disclose the claimed "scene."

Independent claim 27 also recites "providing a communication service between an interpreter of the script and each component." The Examiner incorrectly alleges that Core discloses the claimed "communication service." Core discloses "blaxxun Contact [browser] communicates with a special multiuser server that keeps track of visitors." (Core, p. 4, § MU World Builders, ¶ 3). Furthermore, "blaxxun Contact [browser] . . . [is a] fully capable VRML browser[] that can also be used to view standard (single-user) VRML content." (Id. at ¶ 4). On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner appears to

allege that *Core*'s blaxxun contact browser constitutes the claimed "communication service." However this is incorrect because *Core*'s blaxxun contact browser is not "between an interpreter of the script and each component," as recited by claim 27. Indeed, *Core* does not discuss the blaxxun contact browser in conjunction with the Script node (alleged "script") and is completely silent with respect to the claimed "interpreter of the script." Therefore, *Core* fails to disclose the claimed "communication service."

Accordingly, *Core* fails to disclose the subject matter of claim 27. Furthermore, *Daniels* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Core*. *Daniels* fails to disclose "forming multimedia content by collecting scenes, each scene containing a component group formed by customizing and arbitrarily combining a plurality of components operating on a browser, the scene also containing a script for operating each component" and "providing a communication service between an interpreter of the script and each component," as recited by claim 27. Therefore, *Core* and *Daniels*, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose the subject matter of claim 27.

Independent claims 30, 33, 34, 37, 38, 41, and 42, while of different scope than claim 27, distinguish over *Core* and *Daniels* for similar reasons.

Claims 28, 29, 31, 32, 35, 36, 39, and 40 depend from one of independent claims 27, 30, 34, and 38.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 15, 2007

By: /Michael R. Kelly/
Michael R. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,921